Individual and group level responses to threat experienced by Dutch shopkeepers in East-Amsterdam

Ellemers, N.; Bos, A.

published in
Journal of Applied Social Psychology
1998

DOI (link to publisher)
10.1111/j.1559-1816.1998.tb01357.x

document version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Social Identity, Relative Deprivation, and Coping With the Threat of Position Loss: A Field Study Among Native Shopkeepers in Amsterdam[1]

NAOMI ELLEMERS[2]
Department of Social Psychology
Free University
Amsterdam, The Netherlands

ARJAN E. R. BOS
Department of Health Education
Maastricht University
Maastricht, The Netherlands

The present study investigates how native shopkeepers in Amsterdam respond to the threat experienced by the emergence of immigrant stores. A survey among 101 native shopkeepers confirmed that psychological, rather than instrumental, considerations play an important role. First, perceptions of fraternal deprivation were relatively independent of the amount of egoistical deprivation people perceived. Instead, the experience of fraternal deprivation was related to people's identification as native shopkeepers. Second, egoistical deprivation resulted in negative perceptions of all other entrepreneurs, regardless of their ethnic origin. Third, regardless of perceived egoistical deprivation, native shopkeepers were more likely to discredit immigrant entrepreneurs, as they thought they were more fraternally deprived.

In the wake of the Rodney King trial, the city of Los Angeles was the scene of violent riots and looting. Although these riots had been elicited by the judicial sanctioning of violent behavior that White policemen had displayed toward a Black suspect, the public outrage resulted in violence of the Black population against another minority group; namely, Koreans and other Asian shopkeepers. This was later explained by arguing that the relatively recent emergence of businesses owned by Korean and other Asian immigrant families was perceived as threatening by the Black people who were already living and working in these areas. Thus, rather than being the direct cause of these riots, perhaps the Rodney King trial merely provided an occasion for Blacks to act out their fear that they might lose their position to people who had immigrated more recently into the United States. This sequence of events raises the question of how social unrest emerges. When addressing this

[1]Some of these data were presented in December 1995 at the annual symposium of the Dutch Association of Social Psychological Researchers in Amsterdam. The authors would like to thank Faye Crosby for her insightful comments on a previous version of this article.

[2]Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Naomi Ellemers, Department of Social Psychology, Free University, Van der Boechorststraat 1, NL-1081 BT Amsterdam, The Netherlands. e-mail: n.ellemers@psy.vu.nl.

Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 1998, **28**, 21, pp. 1987-2006.

question, it seems important to determine to what extent psychological (rather than instrumental) considerations may play a role, and to study the different ways in which people may respond when they feel that their social position is threatened by the arrival of immigrants in their society.

Shopkeepers in Amsterdam

The present study aims to investigate more systematically how the native population responds to immigrants' attempts to establish themselves in the existing social structure. It was carried out among shopkeepers in a specific city district in Amsterdam (the eastern part of the inner city: "Amsterdam-East"), where relatively many immigrant businesses have emerged over the past few years. A recent economic survey (Van den Berg, 1994) revealed that, objectively, these immigrant shops are not doing very well. To begin with, they only constitute a small minority (13%) of the businesses in the concerned city area. Furthermore, they often start their businesses ill-prepared. Only 40% had some relevant training, and only 37% had formulated a business plan before setting up their shop. Not surprisingly then, the results of these immigrant businesses are generally quite poor: Only 19% have made a profit during the past 3 years, and immigrant shops frequently go bankrupt and disappear (Van den Berg, 1994).

Thus, the majority of businesses in this city area continue to be owned by native shopkeepers, and the immigrant shops hardly seem to pose a serious economic threat. Nevertheless, newspaper articles about the increase of immigrant businesses and complaints listed by native entrepreneurs with the city council indicate that native shopkeepers do perceive the situation as problematic. Preliminary interviews conducted with representative spokespersons (e.g., the chairman of the local shopkeepers' association) confirmed that the native shopkeepers do feel threatened by the emergence of immigrant shops and perceive this as a conflict between different social groups. This is all the more interesting, given that there is no instrumental reason for individual native shopkeepers to unite with each other, nor is there an obvious cause to perceive a particular conflict of interest with immigrant shops as a group. On the one hand, this is the case because, in principle, all the shops in the area compete with each other for customers, regardless of the ethnic origin of the owners. On the other hand, all shopkeepers have common interests; for instance to attract more customers to the area, or to negotiate with the city council for better parking facilities or more frequent garbage collection.

The aim of the present study therefore is to investigate (a) what leads these native shopkeepers to interpret recent developments as a situation of intergroup conflict, (b) how the subjective experience of threat influences the way native

shopkeepers perceive immigrant entrepreneurs as well as other native shopkeepers in the city district, and (c) which strategic responses the native shopkeepers display in order to cope with the threat of losing their privileged position.

Relative Deprivation

The main premise of relative deprivation theory is that people generally experience dissatisfaction and resentment when their own outcomes do not match the outcomes of other people with whom they compare (Cook, Crosby, & Hennigan, 1977; Gurr, 1970; Martin, 1981). Thus, the emergence of deprivation feelings is the result of comparative judgements, rather than being determined by objective outcomes.[3] As a result, those who are objectively least well off are not necessarily the ones who feel most deprived (Crosby, 1976). When taking a closer look at the different ways in which the value of one's outcomes can be assessed, a basic distinction can be made between interpersonal comparisons and intergroup comparisons. Unfavorable interpersonal comparisons may result in feelings of individual deprivation, while unfavorable intergroup comparisons may lead people to conclude that their social group is deprived, relative to other groups (Runciman, 1966). This is an important distinction because egoistical (individual) and fraternal (group-level) deprivation are predicted to have fundamentally different behavioral consequences. Fraternal deprivation is seen as an important precursor of political protest and intergroup social conflict, while the experience of egoistical deprivation has been associated with social isolation and individual maladjustment (Guimond & Dubé-Simard, 1983; Walker & Mann, 1987).

A recurring critique of relative deprivation theory, however (Kawakami & Dion, 1995), is that it does not specify the circumstances under which people are likely to interpret their situation as individuals, nor does the theory predict

[3]Different relative deprivation theorists have emphasized that the construct of relative deprivation not only refers to perceived inequality of outcomes (the cognitive component or magnitude of relative deprivation), but also incorporates the afffective response to this state of affairs (the affective component or intensity of relative deprivation; cf. Cook et al., 1977). In fact, such feelings of discontent, frustration, or injustice are seen as crucial mediators of the behavioral consequences of relative deprivation (e.g., Guimond & Dubé-Simard, 1983; Kawakami & Dion, 1995). Although our theoretical argument is based on this literature, and hence on the assumption that perceived inequality of outcomes elicits feelings of discontent and frustration, which in turn give rise to particular group perceptions and coping strategies, the relative deprivation measures we used mainly asked about the cognitive component rather than affective responses to relative deprivation. Therefore, we refer to perceptions (rather than feelings) of relative deprivation when presenting the results of our investigation. Nevertheless, given that these perceptions emerge as relevant predictors of further responses to the status quo, we may assume that the relative deprivation our respondents reported not only referred to a cognitive awareness of outcome discrepancy, but also reflected their feelings of frustration and discontent, although we did not assess these affective responses independently.

when people should judge the status quo in terms of their social group membership. Furthermore, although according to the theory, deprivation feelings may occur regardless of objective social standing, it does not address this issue in more explicit detail. As a result, it remains unclear whether similar or different kinds of action can be expected, depending on whether the aim is to improve a disadvantaged position or to cope with a possible loss of existing privilege.

Social Identity

It has been pointed out previously (Kawakami & Dion, 1995; Pettigrew, 1967) that a social identity or self-categorization perspective may be used to complement these gaps in relative deprivation theory. Self-categorization theory (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Whetherell, 1987) posits that the salience of one's identity as either a separate individual or as a group member is likely to determine the way people define themselves, as well as the way they perceive and interpret their social situation. In accordance with this prediction, with different role-playing scenarios Kawakami and Dion (1993) observed that people were inclined to experience individual deprivation when their personal identity had been made salient, while feelings of group deprivation were reported by those for whom their common identity as group members had been enhanced.

Although this salience manipulation nicely illustrates that different forms of deprivation may be elicited, the question remains as to what causes people to spontaneously perceive themselves either as individuals or as group members. Interdependence of group members and the awareness of common goals has been regarded as an important reason for people to feel and act as group members (Rabbie, Schot, & Visser, 1989; Sherif, 1966). However, social identity and self-categorization theorists maintain that, even in the absence of such instrumental considerations, group identification, that is, feelings of commitment to and involvement with a particular social group may evoke a similar inclination to respond in terms of one's group membership (Bourhis, Turner, & Gagnon, 1997).

A recent series of studies demonstrated the important role of group identification as a determinant of social perceptions. People who strongly identified as group members were more likely to perceive their group as a homogeneous unit (Doosje, Ellemers, & Spears, 1995) and to define themselves as prototypical group members (Spears, Doosje, & Ellemers, 1997) than those who felt less involved with their group. This difference between high and low identifiers was most pronounced when the in-group was threatened in some way, while level of identification was less consequential for people's self-perceptions and group perceptions in the absence of such group threat.

On the basis of the social identity and self-categorization considerations, as well as the empirical findings summarized previously, we predict that people are generally more likely to define their situation at the group level, as they feel more involved with their social group. With respect to the present investigation, this would imply that people are more likely to perceive fraternal deprivation the more strongly they identify as native shopkeepers (Hypothesis 1). Furthermore, according to relative deprivation theory, the perception of fraternal deprivation stems from a tendency to make intergroup (rather than interpersonal) comparisons. Those people who perceive fraternal deprivation should accordingly display a tendency to judge other people in terms of their group memberships. Therefore, we predict that stronger perceptions of fraternal deprivation should result in a more negative image of immigrant shopkeepers, while they do not affect the evaluation of other native entrepreneurs (Hypothesis 2a). Conversely, perceptions of egoistical deprivation result from interpersonal comparisons, which imply that group affiliations are less important as a guideline to judge others. Consequently, as shopkeepers perceive greater egoistical deprivation, they are expected to regard all other entrepreneurs in the area more unfavorably, regardless of their ethnic origin (Hypothesis 2b).

Coping With the Threat of Position Loss

The social consequences of different forms of deprivation have only been specified from the perspective of a disadvantaged group. In relative deprivation theory and research, the main focus is to predict what may lead people to engage in collective action aimed at redressing social disadvantage. Nevertheless, as we have explained previously, deprivation feelings are explicitly defined as the result of a subjective evaluation of the status quo, and may therefore also occur among the socially privileged who fear that they might lose their advantaged position. It is as yet unclear, however, what strategic responses may ensue when people try to maintain the status quo or to cope with the threat of position loss.

Likewise, social identity theory posits that people may either try to enhance or to protect their existing social standing, depending on how favorable is their current situation (Tajfel, 1975). In line with this general notion, it was empirically demonstrated that a status structure in which boundaries between groups could be transgressed elicited a desire for individual mobility in lower status groups (Ellemers, Van Knippenberg, De Vries, & Wilke, 1988), while members of higher status groups expressed the desire to hold on to their current group membership (Ellemers, Doosje, Van Knippenberg, & Wilke, 1992). Notwithstanding the recognition that status protection may occur, the different identity management strategies that have been described

in social identity theory all specify in which ways people may achieve psychological or actual status improvement (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). In other words, there is no systematic consideration of the different strategic responses that might be displayed when people are confronted with a threat of position loss. Given that the present analysis essentially deals with the question of how members of a privileged group respond to experienced threat, we will try to specify in which ways people may try to cope with this threat by defining different strategies analogous to the ones that are used for status improvement and investigating whether these are related in a meaningful way to the type of deprivation they perceive.

An important distinction that can be made is between individual versus group-level strategies (Tajfel, 1978). Furthermore, strategic responses may either be directed at enhancing or protecting actual positions or outcomes (instrumental or problem-focused coping), or primarily addressing the situation at a psychological level (emotion-focused coping; cf. Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). When we consider the instrumental responses people may use to achieve position improvement, individual strategies are aimed at the enhancement of one's personal standing, while group strategies intend to improve the situation of one's group as a whole. Thus, a first form of actual position improvement, which has been extensively documented (see Ellemers, 1993, for an overview) is through individual mobility, which entails a dissociation of the self from the disadvantaged social group. In a similar vein, when confronted with the threat of losing their privileged position, people may prefer to associate with the group on the rise in order to salvage their personal standing, rather than suffer a loss of privilege with the rest of their group. Thus, like individual mobility, this response, which we will call *integration*, entails a change in group affiliations and would hence constitute an individual-level strategy. Consequently, evidence of integration is most likely to occur as perceptions of egoistical deprivation are more pronounced, while people should be less likely to endorse this strategy as perceptions of fraternal deprivation are stronger (Hypothesis 3a).

As a second instrumental strategy, social identity theory describes social competition as a prominent way to redress the disadvantage of one's social group as a whole (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Indeed, empirical research has demonstrated that intergroup competition is a likely response to the experience of collective injustice (Ellemers, Wilke, & Van Knippenberg, 1993). Likewise, the privileged may also prefer to address a possible loss of standing by keeping the two groups separate, and competing with the other group in order to maintain the status quo. This response, which we will denote as *competition*, constitutes a group-level strategy. Therefore it is more likely to occur as perceptions of fraternal deprivation are more pronounced (Hypothesis 3b).

As argued before, the former two strategies can be considered instrumental responses, because they address existing differences between (members of) social groups. According to social identity theory, however, it is also possible to display strategic responses at a psychological level, at least when trying to cope with unsatisfactory social status. The term *social creativity* is used to refer to a range of such psychological coping strategies, which are only defined at the group level. For members of disadvantaged social groups, two important forms of social creativity that have been documented entail introducing alternative perspectives on existing intergroup differences (Lemaine, 1974), and emphasizing the disadvantaged position of one's group in order to point out the injustice of existing intergroup differences (Van Knippenberg, 1989). Analogously, when looking at how members of privileged groups may respond to the threat of status loss, we also distinguish between two different forms of psychological coping. First, people may not accept alternative ways of making intergroup comparisons, by claiming unfair competition and discrediting the other group. Second, people may simply deny their group's current privilege in order to make the status quo seem more just. In line with the forms of social creativity that have been documented in the literature, these latter two responses can be considered group-level coping strategies in the sense that they involve biased perceptions of the groups involved and their relative standing, but do not address the way in which individuals are categorized. Therefore, both of these psychological coping strategies are expected to be endorsed more strongly as people perceive more fraternal deprivation (Hypothesis 3c).

The Present Investigation

A combination of insights from relative deprivation theory and social identity theory has led us to make specific predictions about the ways native shopkeepers will perceive the status quo and cope with the threat of position loss. In order to investigate the validity of our theoretical analysis and to gain a further understanding of the problem at hand, we conducted a survey among native shopkeepers in the city district in question. We assessed the extent to which participants identified as native shopkeepers, and measured whether these entrepreneurs thought that they were fraternally and egoistically deprived, in order to test our first hypothesis. Perceptions of the two groups (i.e., native and immigrant shopkeepers) were used to investigate Hypotheses 2a and 2b. Finally, we tested whether perceived egoistical and fraternal deprivation were systematically related to different coping strategies by including a measure designed to assess the extent to which respondents engaged in integration, competition, discrediting, and denial.

Method

Participants

This research took place in the city district of Amsterdam-East. All native entrepreneurs in this district ($N = 152$) were asked to participate. The questionnaire was completed by 101 entrepreneurs (response rate of 66.4%). The sample consisted of 73 men and 24 women (the gender of 4 participants is unknown). On average, participants in the research had worked in this city district for 15 years.

Procedure

The shopkeepers were personally approached by one of the researchers. The researchers explained that they were interested in the attitudes of the entrepreneurs toward the demographic changes in Amsterdam-East and how they adapted to these changes. The entrepreneurs who were willing to participate in this research were given a questionnaire and a letter in which the aim of the research was explained once again. The participants could complete the questionnaire at a suitable time. Three days later, the same researcher collected the completed questionnaires.

Questionnaire

In the questionnaire, participants were first asked to indicate their country of birth and gender, as well as their profits and the amount of time they had been working as an entrepreneur in Amsterdam-East. Respondents were also asked to estimate the percentage of immigrant businesses in their city district in order to investigate whether they have a realistic image of the representation of native and immigrant businesses in Amsterdam-East.

In-group identification was measured with five items (e.g., "I feel strong ties with other native shopkeepers in this city district"; $\alpha = .90$). Participants indicated their responses on a 9-point scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 9 (*very much*). Subsequently, we measured perceived relative deprivation. Two scales consisting of six items each were used to measure egoistical deprivation (e.g., "I have the impression that my situation is worse than that of most other entrepreneurs in this city district") and fraternal deprivation (e.g., "The situation of native entrepreneurs has become more problematic by the increase of immigrant businesses in this city district"). These questions were also answered on 9-point scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 9 (*very much*). As intended, these questions turned out to assess two different forms of deprivation, since they emerged as two orthogonal factors in a principal-components analysis, which accounted for 61% of the variance in the

individual items (Appendix A). Therefore, unweighted mean scores were computed for egoistical deprivation ($\alpha = .87$) and fraternal deprivation ($\alpha = .85$).

Next, two identical lists of 11 group characteristics were provided to measure group perceptions. The first list aimed to assess respondents' perceptions of the group of native shopkeepers, while the second list tapped perceptions of immigrant entrepreneurs. Participants had to indicate on a 9-point scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 9 (*very much*) to what extent they considered each of these characteristics to be typical traits for the two groups of entrepreneurs in their city district. Principal-components analyses for the two target groups revealed a distinction between six positive (clever, independent, active, ambitious, commercial, and professional) and five negative (selfish, suspicious, lazy, ignorant, and unreliable) group characteristics. Therefore, we calculated unweighted mean scores for positive perceptions of native shopkeepers ($\alpha = .87$), negative perceptions of native shopkeepers ($\alpha = .77$), positive perceptions of immigrant shopkeepers ($\alpha = .78$), and negative perceptions of immigrant shopkeepers ($\alpha = .75$).

The last section of the questionnaire consisted of 24 statements designed to investigate the different strategies native shopkeepers may use to cope with the threat of position loss. Again, agreement with each statement was measured on a 9-point scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 9 (*very much*). Principal-components analysis supported the intended distinction between four different coping strategies. After deletion of items that either loaded on different factors or did not load on any of the four factors, this resulted in a four-factor solution which explains 60% of the variance in the 14 items that were retained (Appendix B).

The first strategy comprises five items, indicating that the other group is discredited and accused of unfair competition (e.g., "Immigrant shopkeepers conform less to the rules—for example, with respect to displays and licenses—than native entrepreneurs"). The unweighted mean score of these four items is accordingly used to indicate the extent to which respondents engage in discrediting ($\alpha = .70$). The second factor comprises three items referring to a positive attitude toward the immigrant shopkeepers and an adaptation to the changing composition of the population in the city district (e.g., "I think a further increase of immigrant businesses in this city dictrict would be fine"). This strategy will be called integration ($\alpha = .74$). The third strategy consists of four items indicating respondents' reluctance to engage in common activities with the immigrant shopkeepers, and the desire to organize the two groups of entrepreneurs in separate associations (e.g., "It would be good if immigrant entrepreneurs had their own shopkeepers' association"). We will refer to this strategy as competition ($\alpha = .65$). The fourth factor comprises two items, indicating that respondents deny the privileged position of native entrepreneurs (e.g., "The immigrant shopkeepers in this city district are doing very well"). This strategy will be called denial ($\alpha = .67$).

Results

The Position of Native Shopkeepers in Amsterdam-East

The actual position of the native shopkeepers (as assessed at the time of this study, March 1995) was better than the position of the immigrant entrepreneurs, as measured in the earlier study of Van den Berg (1994). Fifty-three percent of the native entrepreneurs in our study indicated that they had made a profit, compared to 19% of the immigrant businesses in of Van den Berg's research. Furthermore, the native shopkeepers overestimated the number of immigrant entrepreneurs in their city district. Although in reality only 13% of the businesses are owned by an immigrant (cf. Van den Berg, 1994), the native shopkeepers thought that 40% of the shops were owned by immigrants.

In-Group Identification and Relative Deprivation

The in-group identification score indicates that the respondents identified strongly as native entrepreneurs. Indeed, the mean level of in-group identification ($M = 6.01$) deviated significantly from the scale midpoint, $F(1, 81) = 14.91$, $p < .001$. In a similar vein, we tested the extent to which native shopkeepers have the impression that they are relatively deprived. The mean score for fraternal deprivation ($M = 5.89$) was significantly larger than the scale midpoint, $F(1, 81) = 13.49$, $p < .001$, indicating that respondents perceived relatively strong fraternal deprivation. Conversely, the mean score for egoistical deprivation ($M = 4.01$), was significantly lower than the scale midpoint, $F(1, 81) = 30.05$, $p < .001$, which can be taken as a sign that, overall, respondents do not think that they are strongly deprived as individuals. As a result, the mean score for fraternal deprivation ($M = 5.89$) was also higher than the mean level of perceived egoistical deprivation ($M = 4.01$), $t(81) = 9.59$, $p < .001$. Thus, consistent with the impression we gained from preliminary interviews, these entrepreneurs strongly identified as native shopkeepers and indicated that they are fraternally deprived. It is important to note that, overall, egoistical deprivation did not emerge as a central consideration, indicating that whether or not people think that they are deprived as a group is relatively unrelated to problems experienced in their own businesses.

Our first hypothesis was that perceived deprivation should be related to respondents' identification with their social group. In order to test this hypothesis, we conducted correlational analyses. These revealed that, in line with our prediction, fraternal deprivation correlated with strength of in-group identification ($r = .48$, $p < .01$), indicating that perceptions of fraternal deprivation are more likely to occur as respondents identify more strongly with native shop-

keepers as a group. At the same time, no significant correlation was found between egoistical deprivation and in-group identification ($r = .21$, *ns*).

Group Perceptions

In order to relate the way respondents viewed the two groups to the relative deprivation they reported, we regressed the four kinds of group perceptions on fraternal deprivation, egoistical deprivation, and the interaction between these two forms of relative deprivation. For negative perceptions of native shopkeepers, we obtained a significant regression equation, $F(3, 70) = 3.19$, $p < .05$. Egoistical deprivation was the only significant predictor, $\beta = 0.32$, $t(73) = 2.85$, $p < .01$, indicating that respondents held more negative perceptions of other native shopkeepers, as they thought they were more egoistically deprived. Fraternal deprivation and egoistical deprivation did not predict positive perceptions of native shopkeepers, $F(3, 71) < 1$, *ns*. When we turn to negative perceptions of immigrant shopkeepers, both egoistical deprivation, $\beta = 0.27$, $t(64) = 2.38$, $p < .02$, and fraternal deprivation, $\beta = 0.24$, $t(64) = 1.96$, $p < .06$, emerge as predictors in the regression, $F(3, 61) = 5.33$, $p < .005$. Thus, negative perceptions of native shopkeepers may either stem from perceived egoistical deprivation or from fraternal deprivation. Finally, it turned out that positive perceptions of immigrant entrepreneurs were related to the interaction between egoistical deprivation and fraternal deprivation, $\beta = 0.31$, $t(67) = 2.38$, $p < .05$; $F(3, 64) = 3.46$, $p < .05$. Respondents are less likely to hold positive perceptions of immigrant shopkeepers as they perceive more fraternal deprivation, provided that egoistical deprivation is low. The level of fraternal deprivation is less relevant as a predictor of positive perceptions of immigrant entrepreneurs when respondents perceive strong egoistical deprivation.

Thus, when we look at how egoistical and fraternal deprivation may be used to predict perceptions of native (in-group) and immigrant (out-group) shopkeepers, the results corroborate our predictions. In Hypothesis 2a, we predicted that respondents would be more likely to hold a negative image of immigrant shopkeepers, as they perceive more fraternal deprivation. Indeed, fraternal deprivation proved to predict the occurrence of negative perceptions of immigrant shopkeepers. In a similar vein, when respondents thought that they were more fraternally deprived, they held less positive perceptions of immigrant entrepreneurs, although this latter effect only emerged for respondents who perceived little egoistical deprivation. The general argument underlying our prediction in Hypothesis 2a was further corroborated by the finding that neither positive nor negative perceptions of native entrepreneurs could be predicted from the level of perceived fraternal deprivation.

In line with Hypothesis 2b, egoistical deprivation emerged as a significant predictor of negative perceptions of immigrant shopkeepers, as well as

negative perceptions of native shopkeepers. Thus, native shopkeepers who thought that they were egoistically deprived held less favorable perceptions of other members of their own group, as well as members of the other group. Although perceived egoistical deprivation did not affect the extent to which respondents attribute positive traits to the two groups of shopkeepers, these findings with respect to negative group perceptions corroborate our argument that a strong sense of egoistical deprivation results in an unfavorable stance toward other entrepreneurs, regardless of their ethnic origin.

The Use of Different Coping Strategies

In a similar vein, we investigated whether egoistical deprivation, fraternal deprivation, or the interaction between them might predict the occurrence of each of the four coping strategies. In Hypotheses 3a, 3b, and 3c, we predicted that people should be more likely to endorse integration as they perceive egoistical, rather than fraternal deprivation, while they should be more inclined to engage in competition, discrediting, and denial with stronger fraternal deprivation.

Although we obtained a significant regression equation for integration, $F(3, 73) = 3.44$, $p < .05$, with egoistical deprivation emerging as the only significant predictor, $\beta = -0.25$, $t(76) = 2.25$, $p < .05$, the direction of the effect is opposite to what we predicted. The negative beta weight indicates that with greater perceived egoistical deprivation, respondents were less rather than more likely to integrate.

Support for our prediction that fraternal deprivation would be related to the other strategic responses was obtained for discrediting only, $\beta = 0.51$, $t(77) = 2.83$, $p < .001$; $F(3, 74) = 13.04$, $p < .001$. In line with our expectation, respondents were more likely to discredit immigrant shopkeepers as they perceived more fraternal deprivation. Neither the use of competition, $F(3, 71) = 1.64$, *ns*, nor of denial, $F(3, 71) < 1$, *ns*, as a coping strategy was reliably related to the level of deprivation respondents reported.

Discussion

The results of this study convincingly demonstrate that psychological rather than instrumental considerations play an important role in determining the way native shopkeepers respond to the increase of immigrant businesses. This is not only evident from the way that these native entrepreneurs perceive and interpret the status quo, but is also apparent when we consider how they try to cope with the threat of position loss. Taken together, then, these results corroborate the validity of our theoretical analysis, and in large part support the hypotheses we derived by combining insights from relative deprivation theory

with social identity theory. We will first assess to what extent our theoretical predictions were supported by the empirical results of this study. Then we will consider the implications of these findings in a broader theoretical sense.

First, it turned out that, overall, the native shopkeepers are doing relatively well, both in terms of the proportion of businesses that they own in the city district, and in terms of the profit that they make. In other words, compared to the immigrant shopkeepers, the native entrepreneurs do have a better position. This is consistent with our assumption, and underlines that the experience of deprivation is relative and may occur comparatively independently of objective differences in social positions. Second, it is important to determine whether deprivation is perceived at the individual or group level, as these are likely to have fundamentally different consequences. In our theoretical analysis, we used insights from self-categorization theory and social identity theory to predict that people are generally more likely to make intergroup comparisons and hence to perceive fraternal, rather than egoistical deprivation as they identify more strongly with their social groups.

In the introduction, we argued that, in principle, in their businesses all entrepreneurs essentially compete with each other, and to the extent that they have common interests as shopkeepers, these are shared with all other entrepreneurs in the city district. However, despite the fact that they are equally interdependent with immigrant entrepreneurs, it turns out that native shopkeepers have a strong sense of in-group identification. Consequently, as predicted in Hypothesis 1, our respondents reported fraternal deprivation feelings, rather than egoistical deprivation. Of course, from the present study we can only infer that in-group identification and fraternal deprivation are correlated. Nevertheless, laboratory experimentation has revealed that differences in the level of in-group identification determine how group members perceive and respond to the intergroup situation (cf. Doosje et al., 1995; Spears et al., 1997), which supports the plausibility of our causal interpretation of the present correlational data. There is another interesting conclusion that may be drawn from the relative independence of egoistical and fraternal deprivation, and which again underlines the subjective nature of such deprivation perceptions. The people who reported the highest levels of fraternal deprivation are not necessarily those who think they are egoistically deprived. In other words, there is no evidence that fraternal deprivation results when people generalize their own business problems to the group of native entrepreneurs as a whole. Instead, as we have seen, perceptions of fraternal deprivation are relatively independent of one's own objective situation, but are mainly related to a strong sense of identification with native shopkeepers.

The importance of distinguishing between egoistical and fraternal deprivation is underlined by the finding that these forms of deprivation differentially

affect group perceptions, as predicted. We argued that the experience of fraternal deprivation involves making intergroup comparisons. Hence, it should entail a less positive perception of immigrant shopkeepers, while the in-group of native entrepreneurs should be regarded equally positively, regardless of whether or not people feel fraternally deprived. Indeed, in line with Hypothesis 2a, it turned out that respondents held more negative and less positive perceptions of immigrant shopkeepers, as they thought they were more deprived as a group, while fraternal deprivation had no comparable effect on perceptions of native entrepreneurs. However, to the extent that the experience of egoistical deprivation indicates that people make interpersonal comparisons, it should affect the way in which in-group as well as out-group members are perceived. Therefore, we predicted that with a stronger sense of egoistical deprivation, respondents should hold more negative perceptions both of the in-group of native shopkeepers and of the out-group of immigrant shopkeepers. Indeed, it turned out that as people reported higher levels of egoistical deprivation, they did not only perceive the immigrant shopkeepers more unfavorably, but were also more inclined to ascribe negative traits to their own group of native entrepreneurs, which supports our prediction in Hypothesis 2b.

A final goal of the present investigation was to explore the possibility to identify different strategies people may use to cope with the threat of position loss, analogously to the strategic responses to social disadvantage that are documented in the literature. Thus, we not only distinguished between individual- and group-level responses, but also tried to assess instrumental as well as psychological coping strategies. Contrary to what we predicted in Hypothesis 3a, respondents were less likely to endorse integration as a coping strategy as they perceived more egoistical deprivation. This implies that respondents were more inclined to integrate with the group of immigrant shopkeepers as they thought they were less individually deprived. If we may interpret this finding in a broader sense, it might indicate that members of a privileged group are only prepared to associate with the other group when they do not feel threatened as individuals. Thus, rather than constituting an attempt to salvage one's personal standing when one's group may lose its privileged position, individual integration with the group on the rise is observed among people who feel secure about their current standing. Furthermore, contrary to what we predicted in hypothesis 3b, we found no support for our contention that fraternal deprivation might elicit competition on the part of our respondents. Thus, neither at the individual level (cf. Hypothesis 3a) nor at the group level (cf. Hypothesis 3b) were there indications that relative deprivation leads people to use instrumental coping strategies.

In accordance with our prediction in Hypothesis 3c, we found that respondents were more likely to discredit the group of immigrant entrepreneurs as a

psychological coping strategy, as they perceived stronger fraternal deprivation. The other psychological coping strategy we defined, denial, was not related to fraternal or egoistical deprivation. Although this may indicate that denial was not used by these respondents in response to perceived deprivation, such a conclusion has to be drawn with caution, as it may well be that our measure, which eventually only comprised two items, did not successfully capture the coping response we aimed to assess.

Our general argument that psychological responses, rather than instrumental considerations, play an important role is empirically corroborated in different ways. First, although there was no greater interdependence between native shopkeepers than among all entrepreneurs in the city district, native shopkeepers strongly identified as a social group. Second, the perception of fraternal deprivation, and the ensuing effects, occurred relatively independently of the question as to whether respondents thought they were deprived as individuals. Third, instead of reflecting objective features of the groups involved, people's group perceptions systematically depended on the kind of deprivation that they experienced. Finally, we found no evidence that the experience of deprivation induced people to engage in instrumental strategies, such as integration or competition. Instead, it turned out that respondents were less inclined to integrate with the group of immigrant shopkeepers when they thought that they were egoistically deprived. The only coping strategy that was endorsed more strongly as respondents reported more deprivation was discrediting. It is important to note that this strategy mainly entails accusing the group of immigrant shopkeepers of unfair competition, which may serve to reinterpret or justify the status quo, but is not directed at influencing future developments.

Our finding that perceived deprivation does not predict the occurrence of instrumental coping strategies is all the more interesting, given that the use of individual- and group-level instrumental strategies (i.e., individual mobility and social competition) is observed quite consistently among members of socially disadvantaged groups. Although we used theoretical insights and empirical data with respect to status improvement to derive hypotheses about the kinds of strategies that may be used to cope with a threat of position loss, this divergence in the results that were obtained implies that other psychological processes may play a role in the case of status protection. Indeed, upon further consideration, one could argue that there is a fundamental difference between striving for status improvement on the one hand and attempting to maintain or protect a favorable position on the other hand. Dissatisfaction with the current state of affairs, as may be experienced by members of disadvantaged social groups, should motivate people to undertake some kind of action in order to challenge the status quo and to improve their social standing. By contrast, members of privileged groups who experience a threat of

position loss are satisfied with the way things are and essentially want to avoid any changes. Thus, it may be argued that when status improvement is the goal, instrumental strategies are likely to be used, while status protection motives which primarily elicit attempts to justify the status quo should involve the use of psychological coping strategies.

In sum, the present investigation demonstrates that a combination of insights from social identity theory and relative deprivation theory is useful to understand the problem of how members of the host society may respond to the threat of position loss by the arrival of groups of immigrants. This combined theoretical approach allows us to specify the occurrence of particular responses, depending on people's strength of in-group identification and their concomitant experience of egoistical or fraternal deprivation. Furthermore, our attempt to identify different possible strategies that group members may use to cope with the threat of position loss seemed successful, in the sense that the experience of threat turned out to elicit psychological coping, while instrumental strategies were less likely to occur.

References

Bourhis, R. Y., Turner, J. C., & Gagnon, A. (1997). Interdependence, social identity and discrimination: Some empirical considerations. In R. Spears, P. J. Oakes, N. Ellemers, & S. A. Haslam (Eds.), *The social psychology of stereotyping and group life* (pp. 273-295). Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.

Cook, T. D., Crosby, F., & Hennigan, K. M. (1977). The construct validity of relative deprivation. In J. M. Suls & R. L. Miller (Eds.), *Social comparison processes* (pp. 307-333). Washington, DC: Hemisphere.

Crosby, F. (1976). A model of egoistical relative deprivation. *Psychological Review*, **83**, 85-113.

Doosje, B., Ellemers, N., & Spears, R. (1995). Perceived intragroup variability as a function of group status and identification. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, **31**, 410-436.

Ellemers, N. (1993). The influence of socio-structural variables on identity enhancement strategies. *European Review of Social Psychology*, **4**, 27-57.

Ellemers, N., Doosje, E. J., Van Knippenberg, A., & Wilke, H. (1992). Status protection in high status minorities. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, **22**, 123-140.

Ellemers, N., Van Knippenberg, A., De Vries, N., & Wilke, H. (1988). Social identification and permeability of group boundaries. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, **18**, 497-513.

Ellemers, N., Wilke, H., & Van Knippenberg, A. (1993). Effects of the legitimacy of low group or individual status on individual and collective

identity enhancement strategies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **64**, 766-778.

Guimond, S., & Dubé-Simard, L. (1983). Relative deprivation theory and the Quebec nationalist movement: The cognition–emotion distinction and the personal–group deprivation issue. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **44**, 526-535.

Gurr, T. R. (1970). *Why men rebel*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kawakami, K., & Dion, K. L. (1993). The impact of salient self-identities on relative deprivation and action intentions. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, **23**, 525-540.

Kawakami, K., & Dion, K. L. (1995). Social identity and affect as determinants of collective action. *Theory and Psychology*, **5**, 551-577.

Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. New York, NY: Springer.

Lemaine, G. (1974). Social differentiation and social originality. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, **4**, 17-52.

Martin, J. (1981). Relative deprivation: A theory of distributive injustice for an era of shrinking resources. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, **3**, 53-107.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1967). Social evaluation theory: Convergences and applications. In D. Levine (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation* (pp. 241-311). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Rabbie, J. M., Schot, J. C., & Visser, L. (1989). Social identity theory: A conceptual and empirical critique from the perspective of a behavioural interaction model. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, **19**, 171-202.

Runciman, W. (1966). *Relative deprivation and social justice*. London, UK: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Sherif, M. (1966). *In common predicament: Social psychology of intergroup conflict and cooperation*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Spears, R., Doosje, B., & Ellemers, N. (1997). Self-stereotyping in the face of threats to group status and distinctiveness: The role of group identification. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **23**, 538-553.

Tajfel, H. (1975). The exit of social mobility and the voice of social change. *Social Science Information*, **14**, 101-118.

Tajfel, H. (1978). Interindividual behavior and intergroup behavior. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 27-60). New York, NY: Academic.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of social conflict. In W. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Whetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Van den Berg, A. (1994). *Allochtone ondernemers in stadsdeel Oost. Een onderzoek naar het funktioneren van de ondernemende allochtoon* [Immigrant entrepreneurs in East-Amsterdam. An investigation into the performance of enterprising immigrants]. Unpublished research report, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

Van Knippenberg, A. (1989). Strategies of identity management. In J. P. Van Oudenhoven & T. M. Willemsen (Eds.), *Ethnic minorities: Social-psychological perspectives* (pp. 59-76). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Walker, I., & Mann, L. (1987). Unemployment, relative deprivation, and social protest. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **13**, 275-283.

Appendix A

Factor Loadings on Factor 1 (Egoistical Deprivation) and Factor 2 (Fraternal Deprivation) After Varimax Rotation (Only Factor Loadings Higher Than .5 Are Presented)

	Factor 1	Factor 2
Egoistical Deprivation 1	.56	—
Egoistical Deprivation 2	.87	—
Egoistical Deprivation 3	.89	—
Egoistical Deprivation 4	.83	—
Egoistical Deprivation 5	.68	—
Egoistical Deprivation 6	.66	—
Fraternal Deprivation 1	—	.79
Fraternal Deprivation 2	—	.73
Fraternal Deprivation 3	—	.79
Fraternal Deprivation 4	—	.54
Fraternal Deprivation 5	—	.82
Fraternal Deprivation 6	—	.72

Appendix B

Factor Loadings on Factor 1 (Discrediting), Factor 2 (Integration), Factor 3 (Competition), and Factor 4 (Denial) After Varimax Rotation (Only Factor Loadings Higher Than .5 Are Presented)

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
Discrediting 1	.69	—	—	—
Discrediting 2	.71	—	—	—
Discrediting 3	.61	—	—	—
Discrediting 4	.58	—	—	—
Discrediting 5	.70	—	—	—
Integration 1	—	.76	—	—
Integration 2	—	.82	—	—
Integration 3	—	.78	—	—
Competition 1	—	—	.72	—
Competition 2	—	—	.70	—
Competition 3	—	—	.55	—
Competition 4	—	—	.79	—
Denial 1	—	—	—	.86
Denial 2	—	—	—	.86